

**SAN ANTONIO HISTORIC AND DESIGN REVIEW COMMISSION
OFFICIAL MINUTES
July 20, 2016**

- The Historic and Design Review Commission of the City of San Antonio met in session at 3:00 P.M., in the Board Room, Development and Business Services Center, 1901 S. Alamo
- The meeting was called to order by Commissioner Guarino, Chair and the roll was called by the Secretary.

PRESENT: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

ABSENT: Laffoon, Brittain

- Chairman's Statement
- Announcements
 - Historic Homeowner Fair - August 27, 2016 - 9:30 AM - 3 PM - Pearl Stable, 307 Pearl Pkwy
 - STAR in the Mission District - Application Deadline - August 31
- Citizens to be heard
 - Brady Alexander
 - Maria Torres
 - Sofia Torres
 - Ron Rocha
 - Rhett Smith
 - Lance Aaron
 - Antonio Diaz

The Commission then considered the Consent Agenda which consisted of:

- | | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| • Item # 1, Case No. 2016-285 | 235 W Houston St |
| • Item # 2, Case No. 2015-284 | 718 N Pine St |
| • Item # 3 Case No 2016-280 | 416 Lamar St |
| • Item # 4, Case No. 2016-281 | 201 E Grayson St |
| • Item # 5, Case No. 2016-264 | 410 Leigh St |
| • Item # 6, Case No. 2016-270 | 515 Adams St |
| • Item # 7, Case No. 2016-265 | 419 Donaldson Ave |
| • Item # 8, Case No. 2016-268 | 2220 W Huisache Ave |
| • Item # 9, Case No. 2016-420 | 401 E Locust |
| • Item #10, Case No. 2016-209 | 2046 W Mistletoe |
| • Item #11 Case No. 2016-283 | 1115 Nolan |
| • Item #12 Case No. 2016-D06 | 215 N San Saba |
| • Item #13 Case No. 2016-277 | 3700 N St Marys |
| • Item #14 Case No. 2016-275 | Mission San Jose Portal- VFW Boulevard at San Antonio River |
| • Item #15 Case No. 2016-276 | 201 W Commerce St |
| • Item #16 Case No. 2016-272 | 1805 E Hildebrand |
| • Item #17 Case No. 2016-511 | 511 Dawson St |
| • Item #18 Case No. 2016-259 | 305, 311, 313, 315 E Houston St |
| • Item #19 Case No. 2016-273 | 442 E Huisache Ave |
| • Item #27 Case No. 2016-238 | 315 W Lynwood |

Item #1 was pulled for a citizen to be heard & Item #18 was pulled for recusal. Item #7 was moved to individual consideration by request of OHP staff.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve the Consent Agenda with staff recommendations based on the findings.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

July 20, 2016

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED.

1. HDRC NO. 2016-232

Applicant: Irby Hightower/Alamo Architects

Address: 235 W HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to construct an office tower on the lot at 235 W Houston Street.

FINDINGS:

a. Conceptual approval is the review of general design ideas and principles (such as scale and setback). Specific design details reviewed at this stage are not binding and may only be approved through a Certificate of Appropriateness for final approval.

b. The lot currently bounded by N Flores to the east, W Travis to the north, Camaron to the west and W Houston to the south currently features surface parking which covers the eastern half of the lot, a motor bank canopy and teller building on the western half of the lot, a stone wall which runs parallel to W Houston and trees which border the lot on each side. There are no historic structures located on the lot. This property falls within the boundaries for the proposed River Improvement Overlay District 7. The current zoning is Downtown and Historic.

c. This case was reviewed by the Design Review Committee on the tower's proposed orientation, landscaping, massing and the inclusion of ground level retail to be incorporated within the structured parking.

d. **FAÇADE ORIENTATION** – The Guidelines for New Construction 1.A. and B states that the facades of new construction should align with the front façade of adjacent structures, should be oriented consistently with adjacent and nearby structures and should feature primary building entrances that are oriented towards street frontage. The applicant has proposed for the tower to occupy the western-most portion of the site to address N Flores Street with a parking garage wrapped in retail to address W Travis, Camaron and W Houston Streets. Staff finds the applicant's proposal to orient primary and secondary entrances and well as retail space toward each street appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

e. **SCALE & MASS** – New construction for properties zoned Historic should feature building massing and form that is comparable to surrounding parcels. The applicant has proposed a structure to feature 23 floors and approximately 385 feet in height. There are various structures featuring multiple floors in the immediate vicinity including the existing Frost Tower, the Weston Centre, the Wyndham San Antonio Riverwalk and the historic Robert E Lee Hotel. Staff finds the proposed height appropriate.

f. **FAÇADE CONFIGURATION** – The facades of new commercial buildings should be in keeping with established patterns. Maintaining horizontal elements within adjacent building sections such as a base, midsection and cap establishes consistency within the street wall. The applicant has proposed a base which includes a transparent glass and internal sunshades, a mid-section of octagonal shimmering facets and a tapering shaft and a capital featuring a tapering crown element. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

g. **LOT COVERAGE** – New construction should be consistent with nearby structures in regards to a building to lot ratio. Many structures in the immediate vicinity cover large majorities of the lot if not all of the lot. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **MATERIALS** – The applicant has proposed materials that primarily consist of a glass curtainwall system for the tower and a patterned metal scrim. Staff finds these materials appropriate and consistent with examples found in the vicinity of the proposed tower.

i. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The Guidelines for New Construction 4.A.iii. recommends the integration of contemporary interpretations of traditional design and details for new construction. The applicant has noted that the proposed octagonal design utilizes facets on each side to reduce the bulk of the structure's massing and to create a memorable presence that recalls San Antonio's earliest skyscrapers, the Emily Morgan Hotel and the Tower Life Building. Staff finds the applicant's contemporary interpretations appropriate.

j. **MECHANICAL EQUIPMENT** – According to the Guidelines for New Construction 6.A. and B., all mechanical equipment should be screened from the public right of way. The applicant has noted that the proposed architectural crown is to screen all rooftop mechanical equipment. This is consistent with the Guidelines.

July 20, 2016

k. **LIGHTING** – The applicant has noted that the tower will feature LED pin-striping at the tower's edges to enhance the tower's presence in the skyline at night. Staff finds that the applicant's proposed lighting will not negatively impact any nearby historic features. The applicant is responsible for providing staff with a complete site and architectural lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

l. **PARKING GARAGE** – The applicant has noted that the proposed structured parking is to feature two curb cuts on W Travis, one curb cut on Camaron, is to feature street level retail and is to be clad with a metal screen. Staff finds the applicant's proposal appropriate. The applicant is responsible for providing detailed elevations of each of the garage's facades as well as information regarding the width of the proposed curb cuts.

m. **LANDSCAPING** – The applicant has provided information regarding the location of landscaped areas as well as a narrative explaining the inclusion of a garden adjacent to pedestrian sidewalks. The applicant is responsible for providing a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

n. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is adjacent to the local Main and Military Plaza Historic District, the Main and Military Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, and San Pedro Creek. In addition, the project area is in close proximity to the San Pedro or Principal Acequia, the Spanish Colonial Plaza de Armas and Plaza de las Islas, and previously recorded archaeological site 41BX1598. Moreover, historic archival maps from the 18th century show structures within the project boundaries. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for the project area. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval based on findings a through n with the following stipulations:

i. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed landscaping plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

ii. That the applicant provide staff with a detailed site and architectural lighting plan prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

iii. That the applicant provide staff with detailed elevations of each of the garage's facades prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

iv. That the applicant provide staff with information regarding the width of each proposed curb cut prior to returning to the HDRC for final approval.

v. Archaeological investigations are required. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Grube and seconded by Commissioner Cone for conceptual approval with staff stipulations & two additional stipulations that applicant submit more details on the glass & return to HDRC when they are at 80% of final plan.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

18. HDRC NO. 2016-259

Applicant: Jonathan Card/Clayton & Little Architects

Address: 305 E HOUSTON ST
311 E HOUSTON ST
313 E HOUSTON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting conceptual approval to perform the following exterior modifications to the Kress Building:

July 20, 2016

1. Add a new mechanical penthouse above the existing mechanical penthouse.
2. Add fenestration to the existing mechanical penthouse.
3. Add a canopy at the existing mechanical penthouse.
4. Add a rooftop terrace and landscaping.
5. Extend the existing elevator and fire stair to the roof.
6. Add fenestration at the existing level 5 patio.
7. Remove brick and add recessed windows on the east elevation.
8. Remove brick and add windows on the west elevation.
9. Add a canopy to the level 3 elevator lobby on the west elevation.

The applicant is also requesting conceptual approval to perform the following exterior modifications to the Grant Building:

10. Construct an addition above the existing mechanical penthouse.
11. Add exterior stairs to the existing mechanical penthouse.
12. Add fenestration to the existing mechanical penthouse.
13. Add a rooftop terrace and landscaping.
14. Replace the translucent glazing at the existing windows on the E Houston façade with clear glazing.

FINDINGS:

Findings related to the Kress Building:

- a. The Kress Building at 315 E Houston was constructed in 1938 in the Art Modern style. The structure currently features five levels with an open air patio on the fifth level and a mechanical penthouse on the roof level. The façade currently features fenestration on the north (Peacock Alley) façade and the south (E Houston Street) facades.
- b. FENESTRATION – According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 10.B.i., new façade elements that alter or destroy the historic character of a building's facades should not be introduced. Additionally, alterations should not disrupt the rhythm of the commercial block. The applicant has proposed to remove the original brick façade and install recessed windows on the east elevation, remove the original brick and add windows on the west elevation, create new window openings on the south elevation at the fifth level open air patio and add fenestration to the existing mechanical penthouse.
- c. FENESTRATION – The façade of the Kress Building is currently lacking fenestration on both the east and west elevations. Staff finds the addition of windows on this façade is appropriate. Additionally, the proposed fenestration additions are behind the first structural bay of the historic structure; this is consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The National Park Service has indicated that façade modifications such as the proposed are appropriate behind the first structural bay even on tax credit projects. The applicant should ensure that all window openings are recessed within the original wall plan of the historic façade, should ensure that the rhythm of the southern façade is continued to the east and west facades through matching details that exhibit façade separation and that all window mullions are comparable in texture and finish as elements of the original façade.
- d. FENESTRATION – At the fifth level open air patio, the applicant has proposed to remove two window openings and single door opening that are both southern facing and install a new curtain wall system to facilitate an increase in natural light for the fifth level interior space. The façade openings at this location are recessed behind the wall plane of the primary southern façade, do not align with façade openings of the primary southern facade and are largely unseen from the public right of way. Staff finds the modification of these original window openings appropriate. The applicant should ensure that all window openings are recessed within the original wall plan of the historic façade and that all window mullions are comparable in texture and finish as elements of the original façade.
- e. FENESTRATION – The mechanical penthouse currently features small window openings that are largely unseen from the public right of way from E Houston. The applicant has proposed to modify these window openings by installing new window openings that are to feature openings from the rooftop level to the underside of the proposed penthouse canopy. Staff finds these modifications appropriate. The applicant should ensure that all window openings are recessed within the original wall plan of the historic façade and that all window mullions are comparable in texture and finish as elements of the original façade.
- f. ADDITION – The applicant has proposed to construct an addition atop the existing mechanical penthouse. According to the Guidelines for Additions 2.A.ii., additions to non-residential structures should be located at the side or rear of the building to minimize visual impact from the public right of way. The applicant has proposed for the addition to be approximately the height of the existing mechanical penthouse; 12 feet in height. This is consistent with the Guidelines.
- g. ADDITION – In addition to the addition to the mechanical penthouse, the applicant has proposed to extend the existing elevator and fire stair to the roof. The elevator shaft and fire stair currently feature a small penthouse of

July 20, 2016

rising approximately ten (10) feet above the roof. The applicant has proposed to increase the height of this penthouse by approximately ten (10) feet. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

h. **CANOPIES** – At the existing mechanical penthouse as well as the level three elevator lobby on the west elevation. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 11.B.ii., canopies and awnings should be based on the architectural style of the building and be proportionate in shape and size to the scale of the building façade to which they will be attached. The applicant has proposed simplistic canopies that are comparable in style and massing to the proposed exterior modifications. Staff finds this appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

i. **TERRACE & LANDSCAPING** – Around the existing parapet walls, the applicant has proposed to incorporate a rooftop terrace and landscaping. Much of the proposed landscaping will be within the existing parapet walls. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

Findings related to the Grant Building:

j. The Grant Building at 305 E Houston was constructed in 1935 and features two levels of space with a mechanical penthouse positioned at the far north side of the roof. The structure currently features fenestration on the north and south facades.

k. **FENESTRATION** – The applicant has proposed to add fenestration to the existing mechanical penthouse. Given that the penthouse is void of architectural detailing and due to it not being visible from the public right of way, staff finds this appropriate.

l. **FENESTRATION** – On the E Houston façade, the applicant has proposed to remove the translucent glass in the existing casement windows and replace it with clear glass. Staff finds this appropriate.

m. **ADDITION** – The applicant has proposed to construct a one floor addition atop the existing mechanical penthouse. The addition is to span the width of the structure and feature floor to ceiling glass. In addition to the one story addition, the applicant has proposed to install stairs leading from the addition to the mechanical penthouse to the rooftop level below. Staff finds this appropriate. The applicant should ensure that all window openings are recessed within the original wall plan of the historic façade and that all window mullions are comparable in texture and finish as elements of the original façade.

n. **TERRACE & LANDSCAPING** – Similar to the rooftop of the Kress Building, the applicant has proposed to incorporate a rooftop terrace and landscaping along the existing parapet walls. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.

General Findings:

o. **HISTORIC TAX CERTIFICATION** – At this time, the applicant has not submitted an application for Historic Tax Certification. Staff recommends that the applicant submit for Historic Tax Certification as well as consider pursuing the state historic tax credit (totaling 25% of qualified expenses) or state and federal historic tax credits (totaling 45% of qualified expenses) for commercial projects.

p. **ARCHAEOLOGY** – The property is nearby the Alamo Plaza National Register of Historic Places District, the local Alamo Plaza Historic District, the general battlefield area for the Battle of the Alamo, and the San Antonio River. Furthermore, historic archival map research shows the alignment of the Navarro Acequia traversing the property. Therefore, archaeological investigations shall be required for all excavations. The archaeology consultant should submit the scope of work to the Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends conceptual approval with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant ensure that the rhythm of the southern façade is continued to the east and west facades through matching details that exhibit façade separation.
2. That the applicant provide a landscaping plan noting all landscaping materials at the rooftop level.
3. Archaeological investigations are required for all excavations. The archaeological scope of work should be submitted to the OHP archaeologists for review and approval prior to the commencement of field efforts. The development project shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations regarding archaeology.

July 20, 2016

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Carol Wood spoke in opposition.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to approve with staff stipulations.

AYES: Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

NAYS: None

RECUSALS: Guarino

THE MOTION CARRIED

7. HDRC NO. 2016-265

Applicant: Ronald Catlett David Merritt/Merritt Development Group

Address: 419 DONALDSON AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install three 4"x6" cedar posts on front porch
2. Raise rear shed roof line from 8' to 10 foot plate
3. Remove existing fixed aluminum window on rear and install a triple window with 3 aluminum one over one windows
4. Cap damaged chimney above roof line

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 419 Donaldson Ave is in the Monticello Park Historic District, designated March 23, 1995. The home is a Tudor with stone facades.

b. Existing, the front porch has a concrete floor with one corner wrought iron decorative post. The applicant is proposing to remove the wrought iron post and install three 4"x6" cedar posts, two along the front and the other along the side of the porch. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 7.B.v., porch elements should be based on the architectural style of the building. Staff finds cedar posts and configuration appropriate for the Tudor style house, thus consistent with the Guidelines.

c. Existing, there is a rear addition with a shed roof with an 8' plate. The applicant is proposing to increase the slope of the shed roof line and increase the height of the addition façade to 10' without altering the square footage and installing composition shingles to match existing. According to the Guidelines for Additions 1.A.i., additions should not be seen from the public right of way. Staff finds the increased height of the shed roof is not visible from the right of way and is consistent with the Guidelines.

d. There is an existing aluminum fixed window on the rear façade of the addition. The windows on the front and side facades are aluminum one over one with wood screens. The applicant is proposing to remove the rear window and install a triple window with 3 one over one aluminum windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations, windows should match the proportion of those existing. Staff finds the existing opening non-original and finds the removal and replacement triple windows consistent with the Guidelines.

e. When repairing the foundation, the chimney at the front left elevation collapsed. The collapsed chimney is an exterior chimney on the left façade that matched a secondary chimney on the same façade in height, material and design. The applicant is not proposing to rebuild the chimney at this time but is proposing to cap the collapsed chimney above the roof line. Staff finds the chimney an architectural defining feature and should be rebuilt. Staff does not find the proposal appropriate.

f. Staff made a site visit July 13, 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 through #3 based on findings b through d with the following stipulations:

1. That the windows feature clear glass, and be inset 2 inches.

Staff recommends denial of item #4 based on finding e. Staff recommends that the chimney is reconstructed using the

July 20, 2016

original stone to match the original design and dimensions. Any new stone must match the original in profile and color. The mortar must also match the existing.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Bianca Maldonado spoke.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Feldman to approve with staff stipulations along with the added stipulation that the applicant must completely restore the collapsed chimney to its original height, profile & securing to the roof.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

20. HDRC NO. 2016-279

Applicant: Catherine Nored/Nored Architecture

Address: 630 E GUENTHER ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install front yard fencing at 630 E Guenther.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a front yard fence at 630 E Guenther in the King William Historic District. The proposed fence was installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff performed a site visit on July 13, 2016, and found the fence to be approximately 44 inches at its tallest point.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements 2.B.i., new fences and walls should appear similar to those used historically within the district in terms of their scale, transparency and character. The applicant has proposed plum mahogany fence which sits atop a brick base of approximately eight (8) inches in height. There are examples of historic fences throughout the King William Historic District of wood fences that are atop a brick base. Staff finds this proposal appropriate.
- c. The height of fences should be limited to not more than four feet in height when located within the front yard. The applicant's height of approximately 44 inches is consistent with the Guidelines.
- d. While the applicant's proposed materials are appropriate, staff finds the overall design of the fence inappropriate. Historic fences throughout the King William Historic District, regardless of material, rarely feature a horizontal element serving as a cap. As it is constructed, the front yard fence features elements that resemble a porch railing. Staff recommends the applicant redesign this element of the fence.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the proposed fence with the following stipulations:

- i. That the applicant remove the horizontal cap element and introduce a traditional picket element.
- ii. That the applicant maintain a fence with one (1) finish color.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD: Cherise Bell

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone to deny the applicants request

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

July 20, 2016

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

CASE COMMENT:

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

22. HDRC NO. 2016-180

Applicant: EJ Lee/Maia Investments, LLC

Address: 3220 MISSION RD

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Replace 3 wooden interior style doors with craftsman style wood composite door with 2 over 2 window lights
2. Replace 5 wood windows with aluminum one over one windows
3. Replace existing side wooden interior style door with solid steel door on front house
4. Replace existing side wooden interior style door with steel door with fan light on back house
5. Replace 4 aluminum windows with one over one aluminum windows
6. Replace 2 steel casement windows with aluminum one over one windows

FINDINGS:

- a. The request was heard by the HDRC on May 18, 2016, where commissioners expressed concerns that the work was done prior to approval and that the windows and doors in place were not appropriate. At the hearing, this request was referred to the Design Review Committee to discuss solutions.
- b. The request was heard by the Design Review Committee on June 8, 2016, where the commissioner expressed concerns for the loss of the original steel casement and wood windows and the safety issues of the back house. It was suggested that re-installing the original windows would be ideal, or if replacement was not feasible then installing the windows with a 2 inch inset to create a profile and removing the divided lights. It was also suggested that front door be replaced with something simpler and without a fan light, maybe with two over two window lights. The applicant has submitted a proposed door that satisfies the DRC's recommendation.
- c. The HDRC heard the request again on June 15, 2016, at which the applicant withdrew in order to bring together more accurate documents and explore alternatives.
- d. The request was heard by the DRC on July 12, 2016, and the commissioners had concerns with reducing window openings and having to patch siding. Commissioners found the new one over one aluminum windows appropriate and found the alterations to the rear house reasonable solutions.
- e. The request was heard by the Design Review Committee on June 8, 2016, where the commissioner expressed concerns for the loss of the original steel casement and wood windows and the safety issues of the back house. It was suggested that re-installing the original windows would be ideal, or if replacement was not feasible then installing the windows with a 2 inch inset to create a profile and removing the divided lights. It was also suggested that front door be replaced with something simpler and without a fan light.
- f. The applicant has also met and communicated staff along the way, provided requested documentation and working with professionals to obtain drawings that the commission requested.
- g. The windows and doors were replaced prior to receiving approval. The applicant has since submitted all documents required.
- h. The applicant is proposing to replace the three front non-historic doors, two on the front house and one on the back house, with craftsman style wood composite doors with 2 over 2 window lights. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with

July 20, 2016

a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds the proposed door to be appropriate in style and material consistent with the Guidelines.

i. The applicant is proposing to replace 5 wood windows with aluminum one over one windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Windows with a nailing strip are not recommended. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff finds that the windows should be repaired, or replaced with wood windows.

j. The applicant is proposing to replace the non-historic side door on the front house with a solid steel door. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds replacement appropriate, but finds the s material not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the doors be made of wood.

k. The applicant is proposing to replace the non-historic side door of the back house with a steel door with fan lights. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.A., historic doors should be repaired, or replaced when necessary with a style of door that is historically appropriate. Staff finds the replacement appropriate, but finds the style and material not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the doors be craftsman style and made of wood.

l. The applicant is proposing to replace 8 aluminum with new one over one aluminum windows inset 2 inches. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows should be replaced with windows that are typical of the architectural style of the building. Staff finds that wood windows or steel casement windows are typical of the craftsman style home. The corresponding pages from the adopted windows policy document have been added to the exhibits for this request. Staff finds the proposed windows not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the windows be made of wood, and match the proportions of the existing wood windows.

m. The applicant is proposing to replace 2 steel casement windows with one aluminum one over one windows. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.vii., historic windows should be repaired or, if beyond 50% deteriorated, should be replaced with a window to match the original in terms of size, type, configuration, material and details, feature clear glass, and recessed within the window frame. Staff finds the proposal not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that windows that were historically installed be reinstalled, or replace with steel casement windows.

n. Staff made a site visit May 6, 2016.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 as submitted based on findings a through h.

Staff recommends denial of items #2 through #6 based on findings i through m. Staff recommends that windows that were historically installed be re-installed, or replaced in-kind, whether steel casement or wood, that the two side doors be made of wood, and that the replacement windows be made of historically appropriate material, like wood or steel.

CASE COMMENTS:

HDRC 5/18/16, 6/15/16

DRC 6/8/16, 7/12/16

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve as submitted today.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

23. HDRC NO. 2016-278

Applicant: Mark Trolley/210 Development Group

Address: 222 E MITCHELL ST

POSTPONED BY APPLICANT

July 20, 2016

24. HDRC NO. 2016-266

Applicant: Eduardo Garcia

Address: 458 FURR DR

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to replace 27 existing, including wood one over one, steel casement, and wood divided light windows with 27 new wood one over one windows.

FINDINGS:

- a. The property at 458 Furr Drive is located in the Monticello Historic District, designated in March 23, 1995.
- b. Existing, there are 28 windows, including 13 wooden one over one, 5 double wood one over one, 5 wood with divided lights, 4 steel casement, and one picture. The applicant is proposing to replace 27 of the 28 windows with all wood one over one windows. There was a fire in the house; most windows are repairable and a few were damaged in the fire and are deteriorated beyond 50 %. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alteration 6.B.iv., windows should only be replaced beyond repair. If beyond repair, replace with windows that match existing in terms of size type, configuration, material, form, appearance, and detail. Staff finds that the proposal to replace all windows not consistent with the Guidelines.
- c. Staff performed a site visit on June 29, 2016, and found that several of the windows are in good condition, including the wooden windows with divided lights and the steel casements. Staff recommends that 16 windows be repaired, and the remaining deteriorated 11 windows be replaced in-kind windows.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval based on findings a through c with the following stipulations:

1. That the applicant repair 16 of the 27 windows with in-kind materials.
2. That the applicant replace 11 of the 27 windows with in-kind materials, type, configuration, form, appearance, and detail.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval of the replacement of the windows as proposed today. Windows that should be used for replacement are according to the windows submitted today.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Lazarine, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon, Feldman

NAYS: None

THE MOTION CARRIED

25. HDRC NO. 2016-257

Applicant: David Libby

Address: 114 E HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Locate fourteen (14) panels on the west facing roof slope, visible from the public right of way on E Huisache.
2. Locate thirteen (13) panels on the east facing roof slope, visible from the public right of way on E Huisache.
3. Locate three (3) panels on the south facing roof slope, not visible from the public right of way on E Huisache.

FINDINGS:

- a. The applicant has proposed to mount a solar panel system at 114 E Huisache in the Monte Vista Historic District. The applicant has proposed to mount the panels of the west, east and south facing roof slopes.
- b. According to the Guidelines for Additions 6.C.i, solar collectors should be located on the side or rear roof pitch of

July 20, 2016

the primary historic structure to the maximum extent feasible to minimize visibility from the public right of way while maximizing solar access. Additionally, solar collectors may be located on garages or other accessory structures where access to the primary structure is limited. The applicant has proposed to locate fourteen (14) panels on the west facing roof slope and thirteen (13) panels on the east facing roof slope. Both locations are visible from the public right of way and are not consistent with the Guidelines.

c. On the rear roof of the primary historic structure, the applicant has proposed to mount three (3) solar panels, not visible from the public right of way. This location is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff does not recommend approval of items #1 and #2 based on finding b.

Staff recommends approval of item #3 based on finding c. Staff recommends the applicant study mounting solar panels on the roof of the accessory structure and the roof of the rear addition, both of which will not be visible from the public right of way on E Huisache.

CITIZEN TO BE HEARD: Paula Bondurant- spoke in opposition to the applicants request.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Grube for approval with staff stipulations.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS: Lazarine

THE MOTION CARRIED

26. HDRC NO. 2016-269

Applicant: Dulce Rivera

Address: 2044 W HUISACHE AVE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Construct an approximately 73 square foot rear addition with wood siding
2. Replace solid non-original wood rear door with white steel door with large window light, and remove existing metal screen doors
3. Relocate side square window to façade of the addition

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 2044 W Huisache Avenue is in the Monticello Park Historic District, which was designated in May 16, 2010.

b. **EXISTING** – The home at 2044 W Huisache is a Tudor with wood siding and a cross gabled roof with two front gables, one steeped pitched sloped gable and an arch over the front porch. The rear has a hipped roof.

c. **MASSING/SCALE** – Existing at the rear of the structure is a hipped roof, double window and a stoop. At the rear of the primary historic structure, the applicant is proposing to construct an addition of 73 square feet with wood siding and a hipped roof. Guidelines for Additions 1.A. states that additions should be sited to minimize visual impact from the public right of way and be subordinate to the historic structure. Staff finds the construction of the addition to the rear and with a hipped roof, which matches the roof form of the existing structure, will not be seen from the public right-of-way.

d. **ROOF FORM** – Existing at the rear of the structure is a hipped roof, double window and a stoop. The applicant is proposing to add addition and enlarge that hipped roof. Guidelines for Additions recommend additions feature a roof form comparable to that of the primary historic structure. This is consistent with the Guidelines because the hipped roof of the rear addition matches the existing roof form.

July 20, 2016

e. **MATERIALS** – The home has wood siding and a composition roof. The applicant is proposing to use wood siding and composition shingle roof on the addition. This is consistent with the Guidelines for Additions 3.A.i., which states the materials should complement existing.

f. **TRANSITION** – The existing rear foot print has an inset. The applicant is proposing to fill in that inset with the addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions, a transition between the primary historic structure and the addition is needed in order to differentiate the addition from the existing structure. The proposed addition features two 4” vertical trim pieces, indicating the start of the addition. Staff finds this consistent with the Guidelines and recommends the applicant recess the addition from the edges of the historic structure.

g. **ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS** – The applicant is proposing to remove a square window from the right elevation of the existing structure and install it on the right elevation of the addition. According to the Guidelines for Additions, additions should incorporate architectural details that are in keeping with the architectural style of the original structure. Using the salvaged window proposed is consistent with the Guidelines, however, staff finds it would be more appropriate if the applicant incorporated the existing rear double window where the proposed addition is to be located to be salvaged and used in the addition.

h. The existing rear door is a non-original solid wood door. The applicant is proposing to replace it with a steel door with a full window light and insulated core blinds between the glass. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B., non-historic windows should be replaced with those that are typical for the architectural style. Staff finds the steel door proposed is not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends the door be made of wood.

i. The applicant is proposing to remove a square window from the right elevation of the existing structure and install it on the right elevation of the addition. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window openings should be preserved. Staff finds the removal of the windows where the addition to be located appropriate, but finds the removal of square window openings not consistent with the Guidelines. Staff recommends that the existing window opening be preserved and the applicant used the salvaged double window in the addition.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 based on findings a through h with the stipulation that the rear door be made of wood.

Staff recommends denial of item #3 based on finding i. Staff recommends that the existing side window be retained and the applicant salvage and reuse the existing rear double window in the proposed addition.

APPLICANT WAS NOT PRESENT

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor for this case do be moved to the next agenda so that the applicant has the opportunity to address the commission

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

21. HDRC NO. 2016-261

Applicant: Jenny De La Rosa

Address: 321 BURLESON ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install:

1. Install a front yard wrought iron fence to be four (4) feet in height.
2. Install a concrete driveway to be twelve (12) feet in width.

July 20, 2016

FINDINGS:

a. The structure at 321 Burleson received final approval on January 20, 2016. At that time, neither the installation of a driveway as it is currently installed nor fencing was approved. Currently, fencing and a concrete driveway have been installed without a Certificate of Appropriateness. Staff performed a site visit on July 13, 2016, and found that the front yard fence had been removed.

b. The applicant has proposed to install a wrought iron fence in the front yard that is to be four (4) feet in height. According to the Guidelines for Site Elements, new fences and walls should be located where historically appropriate, should use materials that are found historically throughout the district and should be limited to four (4) feet in height. The applicant's proposal is consistent with the Guidelines.

c. In the front yard to the immediate front of the window bay of the new construction, the applicant has installed a concrete driveway that is neither appropriate in regards to width nor location. Driveways within historic districts should be located in a manner that is consistent with the historic example set forth in the district. Staff finds that the inappropriate driveway is to be moved and returned to yard space.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of item #1 based on finding b.

Staff does not recommend approval of item #2 based on finding c. Staff finds that the inappropriate driveway is to be moved and returned to yard space.

CASE COMMENT:

The final construction height of an approved fence may not exceed the maximum height as approved by the HDRC at any portion of the fence. Additionally, all fences must be permitted and meet the development standards outlined in UDC Section 35-514.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Cone approval with staff stipulations

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

28. HDRC NO. 2016-271

Applicant: Robert McGoldrick

Address: 342 W ELSMERE PLACE

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to:

1. Install salvaged door at rear where a window exists
2. Fill in rear door and 5 windows on rear
3. Fill in 2 windows on west façade
4. Remove steps and enclose side stoop

FINDINGS:

a. The home at 342 W Elsmere was identified in the Monte Vista National Register Nomination in 1990. The home is a Spanish eclectic style, built in 1923.

b. There is an existing 6 over 6 wood window in the rear, a rear wooden door with a window light and 5 wood one over one windows with burglar bars and metal screens. The applicant is proposing to remove the window, create a door opening and install the salvaged door. The applicant is also proposing to remove these 6 openings and in fill them in. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 6.B.i, window and door openings should be preserved. Staff found the property on the August 1935 Sanborn map. The footprint in 1935 indicates that the rear is an addition. Staff finds altering the window and door openings in the rear appropriate as

July 20, 2016

these modifications are not altering the original structure.

c. There is an existing side door facing San Pedro, with a stoop and steps facing Elsmere Place. The landing and door is screened with wooden lattice and a metal awning. The steps also have a black metal hand railing. The applicant is proposing to remove the concrete steps, hand railing, lattice and awning and enclose the stoop on the Elsmere Place and San Pedro sides, and add an access door facing Elsmere Place, painted to match siding. According to the Guidelines for Exterior Maintenance and Alterations 7.B.ii., side porches should not be enclosed. Staff finds the proposal to alter the existing side porch not consistent with the Guidelines.

d. Staff made a site visit July 13, 2016, and found that the modifications facing San Pedro would be visible from the public right-of-way.

RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of items #1 and #2 as submitted based on findings a through b. Staff recommends denial of items #3 and #4 based on findings c through d.

Staff recommends that the openings on the west façade be retained.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Cone and seconded by Commissioner Connor to approve items #1 & #2, denial of #3 & with the stipulation that the applicant return for item #4

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

29. HDRC NO. 2016-230

Applicant: Daniel Northcutt

Address: 1150 S ALAMO ST

REQUEST:

The applicant is requesting a Certificate of Appropriateness for approval to install one wooden 5.5' x 2' (11 square feet) freestanding signage, 11 feet tall, in existing frame.

FINDINGS:

a. The applicant is proposing signage at 1150 S Alamo, known as the historic Alamo Methodist Church, converted to a commercial use. The building was built circa 1915.

b. Currently, no permanent signage exists except for a 11' tall freestanding metal frame with external lighting. The applicant received approval to temporarily hang two banners. The applicant also received approval from the HDRC on July 6, 2016, to install a 9 square foot graphic to existing front awning, a 2.25 square foot graphic to existing side awning, and four window decals on front decals to be 1 square foot each.

c. The applicant is proposing to install a wooden sign, 5.5' x 2' signage area in an existing freestanding frame standing 11' tall on a 2.3' retaining wall. The applicant is proposing two options, setting the sign higher in the frame, or setting the sign at the bottom of the frame. Including the retaining wall, the signage stands 13.3' tall. The sign is crème color with dark letters. According to the Guidelines for Signage, signs should be proportionated to building scale, oriented toward the sidewalk to maintain pedestrian oriented nature of the historic district, made of an appropriate material, and use a dark background with light lettering to make signs more legible. Staff finds the material and location of this sign consistent with the Guidelines, but finds the color inappropriate. Staff recommends that the applicant consider a dark background with light letters.

d. Staff visited the site June 21, 2016, and found that the retaining wall 2.3' tall and creates a distinct difference between the street level and the patio at 1150 S Alamo.

July 20, 2016

Approval of Meeting Minutes – July 6, 2016

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor and seconded by Commissioner Grube to approve July 1, 2016 minutes.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

Move to Adjourn:

COMMISSION ACTION:

The motion was made by Commissioner Connor & seconded by Commissioner Grube to adjourn.

AYES: Guarino, Connor, Cone, Lazarine, Garza, Grube, Salmon

NAYS:

THE MOTION CARRIED

- Executive Session: Consultation on attorney – client matters (real estate, litigation, contracts, personnel, and security matters) as well as the above mentioned agenda items may be discussed under Chapter 551 of the Texas Government Code.
- Adjournment.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

APPROVED



Michael Guarino
Chair

